

A //

9

Brief Discourse Concerning the
unlawfulness of the
COMMON PRAYER
WORSHIP

AND

Of Laying the Hand on, and
Kissing the Booke in
SWEARING.

By a Reverend and Learned Divine.

2 Kings 18. 4. Hee removed the high
places, and brake the Images, and cut down the
groves, and brake in pieces the brasen Serpent
that Moses had made : for unto those dayes
the Children of Israel did burn incense to it :
and hee called it Nehushtan.

Printed in the Year. 1646.



To the Reader.

THe following discourse falling into my hands, my affection to the Labouring Truths therein argued for, and my concernings for the Information of them that I am every way bound to be a well wisher to, quickly made me sensible, that to keep it in a private hand would be a more Culpable Concealment of a Treasure, then to bury Gold, especially since the Golden-mouth'd Ancient hath long since convinced, that to conceal the Truth, is to betray it; That this Lamp of the Sanctuary then may give Light unto the whole House; the Press hath been improved to Communicate it; blessed be GOD for the Advantage which the Church now Enjoys above former Ages, in so diffusive an Instrument of all knowledge and goodness, as that of Printing is become. I shall forbear to declare unto the world, the name of that worthy Person unto whom we are beholden for this Elaborate Composure; only that it hath for its Author, a Learned and Pious Minister: I

To the Reader.

should be led to occasion him any trouble. And
shall entreat the Reverend Author to pardon my
not asking his consent in thus disposing of his
Manuscript, and I am sure he will not be offen-
ded with me, when he shall hear that many hun-
dreds have been thereby Established in the present
Truth.

T. P.

Sir,

Sir.

Multiplicity of Occasions and diversions will not permitt mee to return an elaborate Answer to every one that shall send Questions to mee. But as for your selfe I have peculiar cause to respect, and Endeavour your satisfaction. And inasmuch as the Enquiries which you have Communicated to mee, are both Weighty and Seasonable, I have thought it *Opera pretium*, to spend some hours in Searching into the Controverted Subjects, being also ready (as in Duty I am bound) to give a Reason of my persuasion to such as shall in Serioulness demand it of mee.

Your first Question is thus Proposed :

What are the Reasons why you Judge it unlawfull to Be present at, or to partake in the Common prayer worship ?

Answer. My first Reason is, from the Original of the Common prayer Book, which with the Ceremonies and worship prescribed therein, I find to be in a great measure Popish and Heathenish. Some have causlessly Complained of Nonconformists, because they affirm that the English Liturgy is taken out of the Popes Mass Booke. Its true, that as the Mass Booke is taken in a more strict sence, a great part of the English Liturgy is not to be found therein. But as the Missal is but for the whole Roman Liturgy (and so it many times is, a part being put for the whole) it cannot be denied but that the Common prayer Book is from thence derived. There are things, (as prayers for the Dead &c) in the Roman Liturgy which are not Translated into English.

but very little is in the English, which is not to be found in the other. This is Particularly cleared up by the Learned Author of the Book called *Altare Damascenum*, which goeth under the Name of *Didocleus*, but Mr. David Calderwood was the true Author. Also there are many Treatises in English, which may bee consulted concerning this matter; particularly a Book called a *Tavall* between the Mass Book and the Liturgy, And the *Anatome of the Service Book* which goeth under the Name of *Dwaiphinkhamis*. And Mr. John Allin of Dedham in N. E. His Defence of the Nine Positions p. 63. 66. and a *Discourse of Liturgies* by H. D.

If you would have a distinct account of the Original of the Common prayer Book, you must know, it was Collected out of three Superstitious Books. The first part of Publick prayer is borrowed from the Papists Breviary. That about Sacraments, Matrimony, Burials &c. is taken out of the *Ritual*. The Order of Consecration, Epistles, Collects &c. is gathered out of the *Roman Missal*.

Hence the English Liturgy has bin well approved of by Papists. A Jesuit being asked how hee liked the Service at Pauls, gave this Answer, *I have nothing against it, but that it is done by your Priests*. When Secretary Walsingham had in Policy caused two popish Intelligencers then in England to have a view of London and Canterbury Service, they were Marvellously taken therewith, saying that the Pope had bin misinformed, for their Service was very like his own; And they thereupon Endeavoured that the Popes Bull might be recalled. Pope Pious. 5. was willing to ratify the Common prayer Book by his Authority, If Queen Elizabeth would have so retained it. Dr. Carriar (a Popish Bigot) Speaketh very favourably of the English Liturgie, because hee saith there is nothing in it Expressly contrary to theirs.

It is very Strange that any of our Liturgicall men should have the face to deny these things. But some of them have Ingenuously acknowledged the Truth of what we assert. Hee that has written Mr George Herberts Life declares that hee dislikes not the English Liturgy the more for being taken out of the Mass Booke. It is (saith hee) taken out as Gold from drosse. The wise Reformers knew Rome would Cry Schisme, Schisme, and therefore they kept what they lawfully could keep, being loth to give offense. Thus, To this Objection, That the Form of our Liturgy is

taken from Antichrist, Dr. Covells Answer, is Wee are Sorry
 that their weakness takes Offence at that which wee hold as
 a Vertue in the Church of England, Namely that we have so
 sparingly and as it were unwillingly dissented from the Church
 of Rome, for surely by Antichrist they mean her. Exam. p. 185
 Likewise, Dr. Boice and Mr. Womack who have written in
 defense of the Common prayer Book, Confesse that it is a
 Daughter of the Roman Catholick, but they say, why should
 the Child bee beaten for the Parents sake : To whom it has
 bin well replied, why should not Hagar and Ishmael bee
 both put out of Dore together. A great Episcopalian
 owns that the Roman Liturgy is like a Leprous House ;
 onely Hee suppoeth that the Compilers of the Common
 prayer Booke, have picked and seraped and plaustrated the House.
 But Hee should have considered that the Rubbith of the
 Leprous Hhouse ought to be cast into an unclean Place.
 And that the Leprosy breakes out still, therefore wee may
 have no Communion with it. But Enough of these Alle-
 gories. I shall further confirm this Argument by two
 Royal Testimonies. The one is that of King Edward 6.
 who when the Popish Rebels in Devonshire took up Arms
 against the King, because of his Establishing the English Li-
 turgy, Hee wrote this to them, It seemeth unto you a New
 Service, but it is indeed no other but the Old the same some
 words in English which were in Latin, saving a few things
 taken out, which were so fond that It had bin a shame for
 to have heard them in English. If the Service of the Church
 was good in Latin it remaynes good in English ; for nothing is
 altered but to speake with knowledge what was spoken with ig-
 norance and to let you understand what is said for you See
 Mr. Fox Acts and Monuments Vol 2. p 667

Another Testimony is that of King James of Famous
 Memory. who in his speech to a National Assembly Anno
 1590. Prieth GOD that he was King in the Sincere-
 st Church in the world ; Sincere then the Church of England,
 for their Service is an ill said Mass, Sincere then Geneva it
 selfe, for they Observe Pasche and Yule in Easter and
 Christmase and what warrant have they for that ?

But what need of words ? Let such as have any He-
 sitancy about this matter compare the Popish Missal &c.
 with the English Liturgy, and they will bee convinced.
 For my own part I have done it and am satisfied
 Now it is a Known Maxim, Omnis honor Idolis est Idolola-
 tria He that shall put any respect upon an Idol, cannot
 bee cleare of the Sin of Idolatry. But the Mass Book
 is an Idol ; And Hee that useth a Prayer, or Joyns with

A Prayer taken out of this Book, thereby puts Honour up-
on an Idol. Wee ought not to Name an Idol but with
Dedication, much lets may wee Offer it as worship to God.
Psal. 16. 4. Exod. 22. 14. Hoies 2. 16, 17.

How then can wee Joyn in prayers taken out of the Idol-
atrous Mals Book, and Offer them to the Holy GOD?

The Bishop of Exeter is too Levith and Gaudy in his
Rhetorick, when he tells us that if Saint Paul were alive
hee would use the English Liturgy. It was Pauls Judgment
that meat Offered to Idols should not bee made use
of 1 Cor. 10. 28 Ergo, A Service Book offered to
Idols ought not to be used. For there is a Parity of Rea-
son. Wee may here take an Old Cyrenian Complainant and
say, *Ad hoc malorum devota est Ecclesia ut id faciunt Chris-
tiani, quod Antichristiani faciunt* It must bee acknowledged
that such of the Church of England men as keep to the 39
Articles in matters of Doctrine are as Orthodox as any Pro-
testants in the world, but as to worship and discipline
they are Extremely Popish: Which has Occasioned (Gruyer
de Test lib. 8 c. 2.) to give them the strange Name of
Calvins Papists: The use of such a Liturgy doth harden the
Papists in their Idlary. Yea, and the Jews themselves are
Scandalized thereby: Its a Celebrated saying among them,
That Christians have their Sepulchres from Arnimus h. e.
Their Prayer Books from Antichrist. Moreover, that the
English Liturgy is Originally Heathenish as well as Popish is
manifest, in that the Popes Liturgy from whence ours has bin
derived, is so. The Principal Parts of the Mals Book
were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans. They came from
Numa Pompilius The Vestments, Holy water, Incense, &c.
in the Roman Liturgy, were taken up from the Heathen;
the Bishops of Rome thinking thereby to gain Pagans to the
Christian Religion, Just as the Bishops of England thought
to gain Papists to the Protestant Religion, by the use of
their Ceremonies.

What Vain Repetitions doe the Common prayer Book
abound with?

In One Service the worshippers must repeat these words,
Good Lord deliver us Eight Times over And wee beseech
Thee to hear us Twenty Times over. The Gloria Patri is
to bee repeated Ten Times in the same Morning or Even-
ing Service.

That the Heathens were wont to worship their Idols just
after the same manner is clear from those words Math. 7.
When yee pray use not vain Repetitions as the Heathens do,
for they think that they shall bee heard for their much Speaking.
When

When the same words are repeated often over like *Eastern* his, *Montibus erant et erant in montibus illis*, it is vain Repetition. Such *Battology* is in the Old Hymns of the Heathen Greeks. And *beza* Notes that the Roman Liturgy does abound with them, wherein men are taught to cry *Jesu, Jesu, miserere mei*, no less then Ten times one after another.

Some of the most Learned Patrons of Liturgies produce it as an Argument for them, that the Heathen made use of Formes in their Idolatrous worship. So, *Jos Vicecomes de Missa Lib. 7. Cap. 21.* And from him *Casaubon*. And when *Tertullian* does declare that the Primitive Christians did pray *Sine Monitore*, Judicious Authors do conceive, that his meaning is, that they did not as the Heathen were wont to do, Say their Prayers by the help of Formes which others had devised for them. But we are sure that God hath strictly prohibited his People all Symbolizing with the Heathen. He did forbid the Children of Israel some Civil usages, because he would not have them imitate the Heathen. Hence they might not wear a garment of Linnen and wollen. Lev. 19. 19. The Egyptian Priests did wear such, and the Lords Servants must not follow their Example. *Aquinas, Lyranus, Tostatus*, and some other Pontificians, as well as Protestant writers take this to be the true Reason of that Prohibition.

Herodatus tells us, that the Arabians were wont to shave their hair, and to cut the corners of their beards. They also and the Syrians and Egyptians made baldness betwixt their eyes, therefore the Children of Israel might not do so. Lev. 19. 27. Deut. 14. 1. They might not sow their ground with diverse sorts of seed, nor seeth a Kid in the mothers milke, because the Heathen did so. But especially they might not immitate them in matters refering to the worship of God. Hence they were prohibited going up by steps to the Altar, or to make any Altars of hewn Stone, Exod. 20. 24, 26. The Heathen who phantied an *august pompous worship* had such Altars as these prohibited ones were. They had groves near their Altars. Therefore the Lords People might not plant a grove near his Altar, Deut. 16. 21. They worshiped with thir faces towards the East, therefore the Jewes might not do so, *Ezek. 8. 16.*

Reason. 2. From the matter of the Common Prayer Booke.

There are many things contained therein which cannot be Justified under this head; It is easy to produce and insist upon many Particulars, which might be Improved as in many

many Arguments Evincing that the English Liturgy is a Book unsutable. and so unlawfull to bee made use of in the worship of GOD.

FOR.

1. Some things appointed therein are now in the Judgment of Sober and Judicious Persons Extremely Ridiculous

How many odd and Sonclets Translations of the Holy Scripture have bin found therein?

Rom. 12. 2. Is Translated thus, Bee changed in your Shape. John 2. 10 Thus, When men bee drunk Luke 1. 36 Thus, This is the sixth Moneth which is called Barren And Gal. 4. 25. That Ager in Arabia bordereth on Jerusalem. With many more the like Absurdities.

But these things are so gross, that the Bishops in their late debate with Dr. Tuckney Dr. Manton &c have yeilded to have them altered, So that the next Edition of the Common prayer Book is like to bee a Little reformed. Nevertheless, they will not Consent to have the Corrupt Translation of the Psalter corrected. Still those words in Psal 18. 9. are Read, Or ever their Feet bee made hot with Thorns, So let Indignation vex them as a thing that is raw. What nonsense is this!

And in the Liturgy, the writings of the Prophets and the Acts of the Apostles, yea and the Book of Revelation, are called *Epistles*. Moreover, those broken responses and Streds of prayer as Mr. Cornwright calls them, which the Priest and People Toss between them like Tennis Balls, seem extremely ridiculous to standers by. Therefore such things ought not to be in the Solemn worship of God, who will not hold them guiltles that take his Name in Vaine.

2. The Common prayer Book is guilty of violating the Sacred Word of God. Sometimes the words of Scripture are thereby obliterated, and others put in their room, e. g. In the Catechisme, the Authors have changed those words in the Fourth Commandment, *the Lord blessed the Sabbath day*, into *the Lord blessed the Seventh day*. Sometimes the Liturgy makes bold directly, and in termes to contradict the Scripture. For whereas in Psal 105. 28 It is said, *they were not rebellious aginst his word*, the Common Prayer book saith, *they were not obedient to his word*, which is directly contradictory to the Truth. Dr Spark. (notwithstanding his affliction for the Liturgy) told the then Arch Bishop of Canterbury that to read the words, is to Charge Moses and Aaron with falsehood. The Liturgy saith, *that the Rod of the wicked*
that

shall not come into the lot of the Righteous, whences Divid
only with; that it shall not rest there. And sometimes
the Common Prayer Book adds to the Scripture.. There
are three whole verses added to the 14. Psalm. And the
Gloria Patri is frequently added to Scriptures, as if it were
Canonical. Sometimes words are sacrilegiously stolen out
of the Bible. Eg. In the 71 Psalm. The last verse is omit-
ted. So are the Scriptural Titles of many Psalms. And I
know not how often those words praise ye the Lord are left
out. Amongst men, clipping and corrupting, of Covenants
Treason. And certainly it is a dreadful thing to add to,
or take from the Word of God, Deut. 4. 2. Rev. 22. 19.

2. In the Liturgy The Apocryphal books are made Equal
with, nay, are placed above the Holy Scripture. In the preface
to the Common prayer Book, it is said that nothing is or-
dained to be read but the pure Word of God or that which is E-
vidently grounded on the same. But, is the Apocrypha so?
Indeed the Liturgy appoints them to be read as lessons, just
as I find it in the Bishops service Books, and in a greater pro-
portion than Scripture, for (as I have observed) of 172
Apocryphal Chapters, but 33 are Omitted. So that their
Books are Equalized with the pure word of God.

In the Conference at Hampton Court the Bishop of Win-
chester Spoke out plainly, and said those Books must needs
be held canonical as infirmities do more. Nay, the Liturgy
salvageeth them above the Scripture by intimating that they
are more Edifying and can be less Spared than many Porti-
ons of the Holy Canon; and by ordering them to be
read on the Highest Holy days, and many of them twice,
some thrice in one Year. (And that which adds to this In-
quiry is, That the Lees, and Magick Prescriptions) and
many other corruptions Doctrines Expressed in the Book of Tobie have
been Appointed to be read as if these things were Divine.

4. Such things are Enjoyed in the Common prayer Book
as (to my Conscience) cannot be Practised with out Sin.

To Instance, Ministers are required to give the Holy
Communion to all new Married Persons, whereas Marriage
Festivals use to be accompanied with such Diversions
and Merriments as make persons altogether unfit for a Pre-
sent actual Participation at the Holy Table.

Why then does the Common prayer Book appoint the
Minister to give them the Sacrament, on that very day?

By that Doctrine all that may Marry may come to the
 Lords Suppers, whereas Marriage is an Ordinance which
 men as men (and not as Christians only) have a Right unto.

So that by this Prescription many will bee put upon making themselves guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and eat and drink Damnation to their own Souls. And this does the Common prayer Book Compell them unto; Notwithstanding in the *Articles of the Church of England*, it is expressly, and orthodoxly declared, that *unworthy Receivers Turbase to themselves Damnation. Artic. 23. & 29.*

Again, When any man is buried, the Priest must say at his grave, *Almighty God has taken to Himselfe the Soul of this dear Brother*, Perhaps the most wicked wretch on the Earth, and that *his body is Committed to the ground in sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to Everlasting Life*; Though hee did never truly, nor so much as vitibly to the Judgment of Rational Charity, repent of his Sins.

What Minister can do this with a good Conscience?

And there are many Superstitions both recommended and Imposed in the Liturgy

The Putting on of the Ring in Marriage especially the making of that Ceremony to bee an Etiential matter is Superstition. And I do not see how Common prayer worshippers, can clear themselves from all Superstition when they use those words in the *Canticle Benedicite dei*, saying, *O Azarias; O Azarias and Misael Bless the Lord.* And when the Priest is appointed to *church women*, and that they must at that time *offer their Accustomed offerings*, it is Jewish Superstition. And the Observation of Popish Holy dayes, Especially such as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as Highly Superstitious. The like I beleive concerning wearing of a *Surplice* a signification of Purity; when Holy Vestments were in use amongst the Jews, they had an Express Commandment from God about them. Should they had made a *Mitre* or an *Ephod*, or any other Ecclesiastical Garments of their own heads, they would have sinned greatly: witness *Judg. 8. 27.* If then the Church of Old had no power to appoint sacred Vestments, no more has the Church in these dayes. It is Incumbent on them who affirm they have such power to produce their Charter. which they can never do. Moreover, the *Surplice* is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Mass Mongers. In the Roman Liturgy, it is ordained that the Priest shall say service in his *Surplice*. And has no power to sanctify bells or water, or any thing else, Except his *Surplice* bee on. Which made *Latimer* when the *Surplice* was pluckt from him in his degradation, in an holy Scorn to say, *Now I can make no mire holy water.*

Neither

Neither can any Priest make his Breaden God Except he have it on. See *Rhem Annot.* on 1 Cor. 11. 29.

Shall Protestants do thus?

Gr. Abbet (who was no Fanatic) in his Book of Antichrist Ch. 11. Sect 26. Saith, that all Priestly Garments whereby Ministers are distinguished from the rest of the Church are a Special part of the Character of the Beast.

And who did the Papiests have the Surplice from?

Partly from the Jews indeed; but also from the Heathen of Id. There were Vestments for the worshippers of Baal 2 King. 10. 22. Bishop Jewel (that great Light in the English Church) in the defence of his Apology p. 246. quotes and approves these words out of Nicholas Leonicens.

The Priests of Isis used to wear Linnen Surplices which thing seems to be derived from them to our time.

For they that amongst us serve the Holy Altars, may not suffer the hair of their heads or their beards to grow, and in their divine Service they use linnen garments. Thus Hee.

Moreover, the greatest of our Protestant Divines have disliked this Superstitious garment.

So Martyr, Brentius, Bullinger, Gualter, Beza, Zanchy, Hemmingus, Polanus. And many others.

To say no more of this. Mr Nickels his Arguments which he proposed to the Bishop of Chester is not easy to be answered. It was this, All Vestments appropriated to the worship of God, and appointed for the signification of Spiritual duties, by the will of man are unlawfull, But the Surplice is so. Ergo.

And the sign of the Cross in Baptism is as bad as this. That I confess was an old Superstition: It Crept early into the Church. But the first users of it (so far as I am able to learn) were bad men and gross Hereticks, viz. Valentin and Montanus. Mr. Robert Parker in his Elaborate discourse about the Cross, proveth that it is a Sin against all the Ten Commandments, and a breach of the very Letter of the Second Commandment. For men to appoint a Religious Ceremony, is a direct violation of the Second Commandment, which forbids all humane Inventions in Divine worship, as any part thereof. And the Arguments which are brought against the use of Oyle, Cream, Salt, Spittle in Baptism (practised by the Papiests) hold as well against the Cross. The Priest may as well take a thorn and prick the Childs forehead with it, to put in mind that Christ was crowned with Thorns, and that Christians must suffer, as to Cross him with any such signification.

Whereby too great a respect is put upon that which was the cursed

Earled Instrument of Christs Death. Suppose a man should honour one of the nailes which fastned Christ to the Crosse, (as some Fable that *Constantine* did) or the Spear that pierced Him, or the whip wherewith Pilate cauled Him to be Scourged, would it not be horrid Superstition? Judicious and Holy Men have argued thus, if a Child should worship the Gallows on which his Father was hanged, that would manifest him to be ungracious and unnatural. And the Papists in adoring the Crosse do as bad. It's true, that the Scripture speaks honourably of the Crosse of Christ, wherby we are crucified to the world, Gal. 6. 14 But that is not to be understood of the Crosse of wood, nor yet of an airy or watery crosse; but of the Death of that Jesus who suffered on the Crosse. In a word Mr Parker sheweth that the Crosse is the greatest Devil amongst all the Idols of Rome. This Superstition hath been testified against by *Zegedinus*, *Lepperus*, *Goulartius*, *Bucanus*, Dr Fulk, Dr Rainolds and innumerable other Learned Protestant writers. Nay, some Prætical men, who could comply with all the other Ceremonies, have Scrupled this of the Crosse in Baptism. Dr. Taler confesseth, that they have in respect of the Crosse retained an uninstituted Ceremony as a part of External worship.

I shall here take notice of but one Superstition more Enjoyed by the Common pryer Book, viz. That of *Kneeling at the Sacrament*, Men pretend that they Kneel out of Reverence to Christ, but Christ himself was Personally present, when his Disciples did partake of the Lords Supper, yet they did not kneel, but used the Table gesture then customary amongst the Jews. Good and wise men have chosen great sufferings rather then to Comply with this Invention. Mr. Cotton (see his Answer to Bailie p. 19) was preferred not onely the Liberty of his Ministry, but great Preferments on Condition hee would but, for one time Kneel in the Act of receiving the Sacramental Bread and wine: but hee Objected this Argument, *Non institued worship is unacceptable to God, Kneeling in the Act of receiving is non instituted worship, Ergo It is unacceptable to God.* So did that Holy and Learned man choose rather to loose his Preferments and his Livelyhood too, then to bee guilty of such a Superstition.

Mr. Dyton and Mr. Ware, (worthy men both of them) dyed in Prison, because they durst not kneel at the Sacrament.

It is certain, that in the Primitive Times Christians did not kneel in the Participation of the Eucharist. In the Nicene Council. An. 325. there was a Decree against kneeling in the Church on the Lords day. So that either these who

the Sacrament administred on the Lords Day (which to suppose is irrational) or there was no kneeling at it.

This is also to bee seen in the *Sixth council* held at *Constantinople*.

Kneeling was first Enjoynd (so far as I can understand) in the year 1226. by Pope Honorius, being fitted to the Idolatry of Transubstantiation. Some Popish writers confess that if the Substance of the Bread remayn after the consecration; they by kneeling before the bread, should bee guilty of as Vile Idolatry, as ever the Egyptians were guilty of when they worshipped every kind of Creature.

Costerus (the Jesuit) professeth that hee would bee torn in Peices by wild horses rather then he would kneel at the Sacrament, did hee not believe the bodily presence.

So that Kneelers do dangerously symbolize with the Papists in their worshipping of their breadden God.

That Religious worship which is before a Creature, and with respect to it, having no allowance from God, is against the Commandment. But so is kneeling before the Bread and Wine.

These things then prove that the English Liturgy is very Corrupt. Now to offer to the Lord a Corrupt thing, or that which is Lame and Sick is Evil Mal. i. 13, 14.

It is in vain for men to please themselves, that though they joy in the Common prayer worship they do not approve thereof.

Mr. Cotton in his Book against sett forms of Prayer, does truly and Judiciously observe. that Paul in practising a few Ceremonies out of the Book of the Law, did thereby declare his Subjection to the whole order of worship prescribed by the Authority of that Law. *Acts* 21. 24. 6 in doing of which undoubtedly hee had sinned, if God had not warranted the continuance of that worship for a Season.

Thus he that shall Joyn with a few Prayers in the Common prayer Book, does really profess his subjection to the whole order of worship prescribed in that Book.

Reason. 2. Because Publick Liturgies of humane composition are an Innovation and deviation from Primitive purity.

The Common prayer worshippers are wont to urge and argue from the *Antiquity of Liturgies*. But I turn that weapon against them. Let not any quibble with the notion of the word *Liturgy* which is as much as to say,

Opus

ἡ Λειτουργία ὡς Ὁpus Publicum, or of the word *Liturgy*, under which cometh from the Greek Λειτουργία *Trecoz*, under those notions and acceptations of the words, who ever denyed that the Church of God has alwayes had a Liturgy *b.* a Service of his own Institution. But set Forms of Prayer devised by men are an innovation. Had a Liturgy bin needfull for the Edification of the Church, undoubtedly the Lord Christ, or the Apostles by his Direction, would have Composed one, which none of them ever did.

And therefore those Men who take upon them to Compose and impose a Liturgy on the Churches, assume to themselves more then Apostolical Power.

I am surprized with wonderment, that in the Late grand debate p. 110. between 12. Bishops and others, with some Learned men amongst the *Non conformists* these words are found, as Proceeding from our prelates, *That there were Ancient Liturgies in the Church is Evident. S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and others, and the Greek tell us of Saint James his Elder then they.*

This very Passage alone is enough to Convince mee, that the Bishops have a desperate cause, I Marvell not that Pontificians such as *Xainlesius, Postevinus, Lindanus, and others* Professed Papists speake after this rate. And yet the more Ingenuous amongst them confesse the Liturgies mentioned to be Spurious.

Durandus in his *Rationale. Lib. 5. Cap. 2.* honestly confesseth the Truth, that in the Primitive Times there was no Liturgy used in the Church.

As for those Fathered on the Apostles, and the Ancient writers (called Fathers) after their dayes; many Learned men, but especially *Peter Martyr Morney, Rivet, Coccius, Rainell, Voetius &c* have by irrefragable Arguments evinced them to be Supposititious and Spurious things. That said to be *Chrysostoms*, the Church is Directed to pray for Pope *Nicholas* who lived not till 500. years after *Chrysostom* was dead. As for *St. James Liturgy* it is so unlike an Apostle as that *Bellarmin* himself judgeth it to be either wholly Spurious, or that others have added to what they pleased. It mentions the *Anchors*, and has other words in it, not known in the Apostles dayes.

Of the Like Authority are the Liturgies Fathered on *Peter, Mark, and Matthew* in which there are Prayers for Popes, Patriarchs, and Arch Bishops, Creatures not known in the world till Long enough after the Apostles were dead.

It is clear from the words of *Justin Martyr* (In *Orat. Apol.*)

who lived 180 Yeares after Christ, that then there was no Book of Prayer used by Christians, for he saith, that the Minister did pour out Prayers, οὐκ ἐν βιβλίῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ στόματι, according as strength and utterance was afforded to him from Heaven. It is as clear that in Tertullians time, (who lived 200 yeares after Christ) there was no Church Liturgy. For hee (*Apol. Cap. 2.*) declares, that Christians in those dayes prayed *Sine Monitore quia de pectore*, without the help of a Prompted Form, because from their Hearts. And that there was no Liturgy in some Churches, or of general use in the Church for above 400 yeares, is manifest from the words of Socrates, (who lived Anno 430) he saith There were scarce two Christians found who used the same words in Prayer. *Hist. L. 5. Cap. 21.* It is true, that about the year 350 (*plus minus*) some Churches in Africa begun to use stinted Liturgies, which was occasioned by the gro'ss Ignorance and Heterodoxy that many of the Clergy were then found guilty of. So that the Council of Carthage Anno 395 Ordered, that Ministers should not use Prayers composed by themselves, *without consulting their more Able Brethren*. Hence also came in Homilies, because many Ministers were as unable to Preach, as they were unfit to Pray. In the declining ages of the Church, many Liturgical Books were composed, *sed ab initio non fuit sic*. There are the Prayer Books of Isidorus, Haccus, Sirabo, Maurus, Berno, Hilabertus, and others, as whose pleaseth to consult *Cassanders Liturgia* will see. These things if searched into will be found the Truth. There are who Plead, that in the Jewish Church of old, there were Formes of Prayer used besides those which were of Divine Inspiration.

Credas Judaeus Apella.

I know that some Jewish Doctors tell us, that Ezra and the men of the great Synagogue, appointed 18 Benedictions, yea and that David appointed an 100 Benedictions. *Vide Buxtorf. Synagog. Cap. 5. In fine Drusii Præterit. ad AEs 3, and 10. Schindler Pentaglot. in voce Manach.* And I have seen Liturgies written in the Hebrew Tongue, but it is easy to perceive that they are late Compositions. They that think so find any such compiled before the Church of the Jewes was degenerated into its present wofull estate, will find themselves disappointed, as Bishop Andrews was, when hee caused a Jewish Liturgy to be translated out of the Hebrew into the Latin Tongue, hoping that he should have found something therein to countenance the English Liturgy. *Generatim*

ward has emitted a Jewish Common prayer Book, wherein are Prayers for the Dead, &c. a Superstitious Commemoration of Saints. Of so Little weight is the Argument taken from the Jews Liturgies,

Reason. 4. *In this Age of Light, it would in mee, (and in all others so Educated and Instructed as I have bin) appear to be a great Apostacy, should I in the Least countenance or Comply with the Common prayer worship.*

The Corruptions of the English Liturgy have bin abundantly discovered and born witness against by many Learned and worthy men, whom GOD has raised up and Enabled to do that Service for his Name and Truth.

The Books of the Famous Cartwright were long since Published. And since that a Treatise called a Survey of the Common prayer, and the Exceptions of the London Ministers, which caused them to refuse Subscription to the Liturgy, and the Apology of the Non conformists in Lincolnshire, and the Reasons of those in Cornwall, and Devon, And the Defence of those Reason in our parts; besides many other Tracts emitted very lately; by all which the Light is Convincingly manifested before the world.

Yet, and there have bin many and those too, not of wilfull Tempers, but very humble and Conscientious, nor of weak parts, but as Eminent for Learning and Judgment as any in the world, who have chosen to Suffer rather than to Sin in Complying with the Liturgy. Amongst those I might mention Dr. John Rainold, Dr. Ames and Mr. Robert Parker (a man of vast reading and Abilities) Mr. Dod (whom Mr. Burroughs has fitly stiled the Moses of his Time) Mr. Bradshaw, and Mr. Nicols, not to speake of others.

Onely I would not forget those Eminent and Faithfull Ministers of Christ who were driven into an American desert, the principal cause of whose Exile, and Sufferings, was, because they durst not touch with the Common prayer Book. And since their being in New England, some of them have by their writings testified against it. The 9 Propositions (though written by Mr. Davenport) had the Approbation of the rest of the Elders in New England, and therein Reasons are given why it is unlawfull to be present at the Common Prayer worship or any part thereof.

Mr. John Cotton of Boston, (a man deservedly Famous in both Englands) has done the like. And Mr. John Allen

of Dedham in New-England (Mr. Shepard of Cambridge Joyning with Him) in his defence of the 9 Positions, has Expressly declared the unlawfulness of being present at the Common prayer Worship.

As for mee, your selfe knoweth what my Education has bin. My Father was an Holy and a Learned man, and one that Suffered much for his *Non conformity*; should I once go to hear Common Prayer, I Seriously profess I Know not how I should bee able to look my Father in the Face in the other world; much less how I should answer Christ at the great day for my Apostasy from those Principles of Truth, which my Father has instructed me in, both by word and Example. *Gal. 2. 18.* Is of weight with mee.

These, Sir, Are some of the Reasons, why I Judge it would be sin in me, to own the Common prayer worship: I have Omitted the mentioning of many particulars contained in the Liturgy, which as to the *Doctrine of them are False and Corrupt.* E. g. It is there affirmed that *Children Baptised have all things Necessary to Salvation and are undoubtedly saved.* Yea, that it is Certain from Gods word that if a Baptised child dye before actuall Sin, tis saved, This favours of *Pelagianisme*. And that there are onely two Sacraments necessary to Salvation, which implies a double Error, viz. that the Sacraments are necessary to Salvation, and that there are more Sacraments of the New Testament then two. And the Book sayth that *some sins are deadly*, as if the Popish distinction of sins into *Mortal and Venial* were a sound distinction. And that Christ has Redeemed all Mankind.

I might here also have added, that a *stinted Liturgy is Opposite to the Spirit of Prayer.* The Scripture teacheth that Christians should pray with all Prayer and Supplication in the Spirit. *Ephes. 6. 18.* which they cannot do if they tie themselves up to a set Form never to bee varied from. I let pass that Argument, from the *Mischief of a Prescript Liturgy*; It is the Instrument of a foolish Shepherd. An Idol and a Dumb Ministry is thereby continued in the Church.

It is well Known, that in a Place in *Kent*, a Common Fid'ler reid Service for 12d per. week; And perhaps that was more then he deserved. But let mee seriously add this further, that a *Prescribed Book is an Image or Help to Prayer devised by men, but not ordained by God*, and therefore forbidden in the second Commandment.

Mr. Cotton speaketh weightily in saying, *It is unlawful* full to bring in ordinarily any other Book into the Publick worship of God, besides the Book of God. To bring in another Book is like bringing in of another Altar into the Temple besides the Lords Altar. If it bee a sin, to set up a Post by Gods Post, and a threshold by his threshold. *Ezek. 43. 8.* then it is a sin to set up a Book by Gods Book, and consequently it is a sin to Joyn with, or to Countenance them that do so.

But before I proceed to your next Question, Give mee leave to speak a few words in answer to that which some take to be a sufficient justification of the Liturgy, or at leastwise of their partaking in that Worship, viz. *In that the First Collectors and Publishers of it were Good men, and diverse of them dyed Martyrs.* Answer. Are not good men, especially in times of Darknes fallible, and their Example not to be followed, wherein they have fallen short of the Rule. In some Ages, good men may do that which if thir Successors having greater Light should follow them in, they would not be good; Witness the Polygamy of the Fathers, not to mention other Errors. But as to the matter before us, thus it hath been. The whole Liturgy was said or sung in Latin in the Reign of King Henry 8. Untill the year 1545, and then the Letany and no other part of the Liturgy was permitted in English; and that was the furthest pace the Reformation stept in that Kings Reign. See Fuller. Church History Book 7. P. 386. In Anno 1548 came forth the first Edition of the Common prayer Book in King Edward. to his time

There is no rule of charity that does require us to believe that all the Persons Employed there about were Good men. For one of them was George Day the Bishop of Chester, Hee was a Dissembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Protestant, but afterwards shew'd himselfe to be a Papist. Yet many set a worke about that affair, were truly Pious men, who acted faithfully according to the Light they received in those dawnsings of Reformation out of Popish Darknes in England. Bishop Ridley had an hand in the first English Liturgy, being the hottest Slicker for conformity in those Dayes, but GOD gave Him to see his Error before his Martyrdom, as is Clear from his Letter to Mr. Hooper Published by Mr. Fox vol. 3. p. 146. 147: Arch Bishop Cranmer was another, and the most Eminent

though the Compilers of the English Liturgy. But it is related in the History of the Troubles at Frankfort p. 42. That Cratmer had drawn up a Book of Prayers far more perfect then that which now wee have, and that it could not take place because he was Matched with, and overpowered by a Popish and a wicked Clergy.

So that the Common prayer Book came forth no better then now we see it. Nevertheless, Eminent Divines did then testify against those Reminders of Popery which it does a bound with.

Mr. Rogers (the Protomartyr in Queen Maryes Reign) and Mr. Hooper (who dyed a Martyr also) were much troubled at the service Booke. Moreover, Great and Learned men of other Nations found fault with it. So did Calvin, and Bucer, and at Last Peter Martyr. And Bullinger declared that Hee should bee Loth to make use of it in his Church. Likewise John a Lasco (that famous and noble Reformer) Expressed great dissatisfaction at the English Liturgy. That Mr. Knox and the Chief Reformers in Scotland, were offended at it, Every body Knoweth.

In Queen Elizabeths Reign, the Bishops made the Common prayer Book to be in several things worse and more Intolerable then It was in the Dayes of King Edward.

For in this time, it was left free what to bee read, nor were some Superstitious Ceremonies then Imposed upon the Consciences of such as Could not Comply with them.

No less then 26 Lessons of Canonical Scripture Appointed to be read in King Edwards Calender, are Sacrilegiously blotted out of the Later Common prayer Books.

Also, the Bishops have Expunged a Prayer against the Pope of Rome and his detestable Enmities, which was in King Edwards Booke, and that Express declaration against the Corporal Presence is in the Liturgy Published Anno 1559. left out, in Compliance with the Papists.

This was the very Reason why the Clergymen were so Inflexible in their adherence to the Liturgy, and the Worship prescribed thereby, it was because they relolved to go no farther from Rome then needs they must, and from a vain perswasion, that they should thereby gain Papist over to their Communion.

But the Learned Trimate of Ireland, does observe and Ingeniously acknowledge, that Experience has manifested that the Papists are not won, but rather hardened in their Superstitions, by such methods.

It may be time will discover that some who pretend Zeal for the Common prayer Book are carrying on a design

For Rome: The Liturgy came from thence, and will
Perhaps lead thither again.

The Riddle of the Snow and the Water may be ap-
plied bete.

Mater me genuit mater quoque gignitur ex me.

Not but that some who Comply with the service
Book, are true Protestants, and would suffer with their
Non-conformable Brethren (who cannot go so far as they)
rather than Embrace Popery.

Nevertheless, the Liturgy hath in it selfe a tendency
that way, and will by such as are not hearty Protestants,
be Improved accordingly.

I Proceed now to the Second Enquiry, VIZ.

What Reason have you to Scruple the Lawfulness of Laying the hand on the BIBLE, and Kissing the Books in Swearing ?

I Answer briefly.

1. *We do not find in the Scripture that the Lords Servants were wont to Swear after that Manner.*

There wee read of Lifting up the hand in Swearing, which is like lifting up the hands or Eyes in Prayer, a natural sign of Worship. To lift up the hand to Heaven is a Proverbial Expression of a solemn Oath. Gen. 14. 22. Ezek. 20. 23. Rev. 10. 4. In many nations they used this gesture. The Judges in France say to Him that is to Swear, *Lift up your Hand*, Except it bee an Ecclesiastick Person, and they bid him put his hand to his Breast. The Romans of old. so the Italians and Spanyards, have used to lift up the Finger when they Swear solemnly.

I cannot justify the Practise of the Germans who in taking an Oath, *Lift up three Fingers* as thereby in intimating, that they invoke the sacred Trinity.

2. *Laying the hand on the Book is a Symbolizing with Popish Idolaters, and Superstitious Jewes.*

This Ceremony is immediately derived from the Popists, who are wont as they lay the hand on the Book in Swearing to say, *So help me God and these Holy Evangelists*, which is gross Idolatry; and it is not much better when it is said, *So help you the contents of this Book*; The Judicium River in pt. 24. p. 308, 309 witnesseth that custom of touching the Book, were not at all used, Hee saith, *The abuse of it by Idolaters, makes it to be a Ceremony not*

Not fitt to bee retained as an indifferent thing: See him also in Gen. 24: Exercit. 110. p. 541.

Some have observed that the Jewes when an Oath was to be Administred, did produce either the Booke of the Law, or of the Psalms, or some other Sacred thing.

And that Superstition of theirs has given occasion to the Papists to bring either the Holy Evangelists, or else some Sacred Relique, and set it before him that is to Swear, whereby to stir up his dull mind to the more Reverence and Religion.

PARUS saith Expressly that it is Popish Superstition for ~~men~~ making an Oath to touch the Gospel with their fingers: Comment in Gen. 24. 22.

3. Kissing in a Religious way is a gesture of Adoration.

When tis said, Psalm. 2. 12. Kiss the Son, the meaning is worship Him. Job saith hee did not when he beheld the Sun and the Moon Kiss his hand Chap. 31. Verse 26, 27. because Idolaters not being able to reach the Sun, in token of Adoration were wont to Kiss their hands, as many Learned men have out of Tertullian Pliny and others, truly noted. The worshippers of the Calves at Dan and Bethel Kissed them 1 King 19. 18. Hos. 13. 2. and so did the Heathen Idolaters, Kiss their Images, a signe of worship. Minutius Felix reports that Cæcilius Kissed the Image of Elerapis, thereby testifying his Veneration and Adoration of that False God. Cicero tells us that the worshippers of Hercules had by their frequent Kissing of his Statue caused it to bee much worn.

And from the Heathen have the Papist Learned to Kiss their Images, yea and to Kiss the Book too. For the Priest in celebrating the Mass, is not onely to Kiss the Altar 9 times, but hee must also take the Book of the Gospels and Kiss it. This is Clearly to worship a Booke; and so to give unto a Creature that honour which is due to God alone.

The most Learned Voetius in his disputation de Superstitione p. 156. writeth against this Practice. And whereas some have Objected that Dr. Ames in his cases, and in his froth saith against Ceremonies, has pleaded for this Ceremony, Voetius saith, that what Ames Speaks is rather an Excuse then an Approbation of that Practice. Mr. Burroughs on Hos. 12. 2. observes that it is false worship.

Worship to give Religious Respect to any Creature; ~~whic~~
 ever the Creature be, by Kissing as well as by bowing
 to it. And (saith He) *I Know no reason why a Book*
may not be set up to bow to, as well as to be Kissed in tak-
ing an Oath.

That Searching and acute Divine Dr. Thomas Goodwin
 has sometimes professed that of all the Ceremonies, He
 Looked upon that of Kissing the Book in Swearing to be
 the most Idolatrous and Abominable, and that hee often
 wondered that it had bin no more witnessed against.

And now, Sir, you have my Thoughts
 concerning both your Questions ; and you
 see the grounds I go upon. If you Judge
 that any of your friends will receive Light
 and Confirmation in the Truth thereby ;
 you may privately Communicate what I
 have written to you. Oaely let my Name
 (which can add no Authority to the Truth)
 be concealed. So I commend you to
 the Grace of Christ, praying that His Holy
 Spirit may Lead us into all Truth.

FINIS.
